

19th August 1925]

(g) The Act (I of 1925) does not apply to Jain Religious Endowments. There appears to be no necessity to appoint a Jain as Commissioner.

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I ask the hon. the Minister, with reference to clause (b), if it is open to the members of the Religious Endowments Board to inspect temples on their own motion ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Yes ; I think so.”

Sriman SASIBHUSHAN RATH Mahasayo :—“ Do not the commissioners draw travelling allowance ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Yes ; they draw travelling allowance when they go on tour.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ With reference to answer to clause (g), viz., ‘ there appears to be no necessity to appoint a Jain as Commissioner ’, does the hon. the Minister know that a number of Hindu temples in South Kanara are controlled by Jains ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Yes ; there are such temples.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ Is there no necessity to appoint a Jain as Commissioner ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ There is no necessity to appoint a Jain as Commissioner.”

Village Panchayats.

Employment of non-depressed classes sweepers in Narayanavaram.

* 111 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether the Government are aware that the Registrar-General of Panchayats objected to the village panchayat of Narayanavaram employing non-depressed classes sweepers for the three Brahman streets at the extra cost of the tax-payers ?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

Depressed classes sweepers in Narayanavaram.

* 112 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that the members of the depressed classes (scavenging classes) are now being prevented from sweeping the public Brahman streets by the Brahman residents of Narayanavaram, Chittoor district ;

(b) whether it is a fact that the members of the depressed classes (scavenging classes) were sweeping the Brahman streets in Narayanavaram, for the past six years without any obstruction whatever from the Brahman residents of Narayanavaram ;

(c) whether after the Government Order, dated 25th August 1924, passed by the Government throwing open all public roads, streets, wells tanks, etc., such oppression is being caused by the Brahmins of the village ;

[19th August 1925]

(d) whether the Government have received any memorial from the Honorary Secretary, Hanuman Library and Free Reading Room, Narayana-varam, on or about the 16th November, explaining the persecutions to which the poor scavenging classes are subjected by the Brahman residents of the village;

(e) whether the scavengers are employed only by the village panchayat of Narayana-varam and the village panchayat has no objection to the sweeping of the Brahman streets by the scavengers; and

(f) if the Government have no information with reference to clauses (a) to (c), whether they will call for the information?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The answer is in the affirmative.

(d) The answer is in the negative.

(e) The scavengers are employed by the village panchayat. The Government understand that the Narayana-varam Panchayat passed a resolution that Irula sweepers should be substituted for Mala sweepers and that Malas should not go into Brahman streets.

(f) The question does not arise.

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—“With reference to clause (e), may I know whether the Government cannot come to the rescue of the community whenever any injustice is done?”

The hon. the **RAJA OF PANAGAL**:—“Whenever cases of the kind are brought to the notice of the Government, they will be considered.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—It seems to be admitted that people of particular classes are not permitted to use the public streets. Is it a matter again for the taluk board or umap, or will the Government come to the rescue?”

The hon. the **RAJA OF PANAGAL**:—“It is a matter in which custom has to be considered.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“It has been admitted that for the past six years they were sweeping the streets without any obstruction. Now the practice is put an end to.”

The hon. the **RAJA OF PANAGAL**:—“The local body concerned ought to be approached. The Government may sympathize with the people but it is a matter in which discretion is left to the local body concerned.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“The use of a public street is something more than a matter for a local body.”

The hon. the **RAJA OF PANAGAL**:—“I think the servants of the local body are expected to do this work. It must be left to the local body. The Government cannot dictate that they must appoint such and such servant.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“Does not the Government give them grant. They can withhold their grant in such cases. There are many ways open to the Government to put an end to this practice. They can withhold the grant or take other measures.”

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—“Has any grant been given to the Narayana-varam panchayat?”

19th August 1925]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I do not know; here is an elementary right denied to the people."

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—"With reference to (e), if any injustice is done by the local bodies, are not Government going to interfere in the matter?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—"I have already answered that if cases of injustice done to these people are brought to the notice of Government, they will consider such cases."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"With reference to clause (c), it is admitted that the Government Order dated 25th August 1924 is not respected by taluk boards. What action does the hon. Minister propose to take for disregarding the Government Order. It is practically admitted in the answer that the Government Order is being disregarded."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The Government say that from a particular community alone the sweepers are appointed."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"The question is whether after the Government Order throwing open public roads, streets, wells, tanks, etc., such oppression is being caused by the Brahmans—it is a question not with regard to sweeping alone, but with regard to throwing open public streets, roads, etc.—whether there is any persecution of a particular community. This is admitted in the answer. If the answer had been confined to saying that with the exception of sweeping there was no disregard shown to the Government Order, I can understand the argument advanced by the hon. the Minister. But he has practically admitted that oppression is caused by one community to the members of the depressed classes, thereby setting at nought the Government Order. So I want to know what action Government propose to take; whether it is in the portfolio of the hon. the Minister or the hon. the Law Member, I should like to know what action the Government propose to take in the matter."

General.

Change of the official year.

* 113 Q.—**Mr. C. MARUTHAVANAM PILLAI:** Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government are having under contemplation any proposal to change the official year to the fasli year?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Are the Government aware that March, April and May are the best months for doing road repairs and for the construction of pounds, etc.? What I mean is that if the official year is changed to the fasli year the Government could carry on their works in the best part of the year when labour would be available."

The hon. Mr. T. E. Moir:—"Does the hon. Member want that the official year should be determined with reference to the question of road repairs, etc.?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"What I suggest is that road repairs, etc., might be done in the months of March, April and May when labour would be most available."